

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. Claims 2, 9, 11, 12, and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

This response is being filed together with a Request for Continued Examination for the purpose of submitting the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement.

In the April 13, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 9, 11, 12, and 19. Claims 2 and Claim 9 were rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, because “lambda” in line 2 of Claim 2 and Claim 9 was not specified. Both Claim 2 and Claim 9 have been amended to specify what lambda was by the addition of phrase “where lambda is the wavelength”. Thus, Claim 2 and Claim 9 are not indefinite. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected because Claim 11 depended on Claim 12, and subsequent Claim 12 depended on itself. Claim 11 and Claim 12 were amended so that they both depended on Claim 1.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Moore (U.S. Patent No. 4,825,223). Claim 19 has been amended to require “a plurality of focal points in-phase”. The Moore patent (‘223) teaches an invention that has a “reflective surface being at least a portion of a concave surface of one of a corresponding sequence of paraboloids that have a common axis and a *common focal point*” (emphasis added). The Moore patent requires there to be series of reflective surfaces that reflect to the same focal point in phase, and does not describe the translation of the vertices. Claim 19 now describes the reflective surface as being “such that each reflected wave arrives at a *plurality of focal points* in-phase”. The instant

application requires a series of reflective surfaces, each reflective surface reflecting an incoming signal to a specified focal point. Thus, each reflected wave arrives at a designated focal point, in-phase with signals reflected from adjacent surfaces. The Moore patent ('223) does not teach or suggest this element. Thus, Claim 19 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the Moore patent ('223).

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

This response is being submitted along with a three-month extension of time, extending the response due date to October 13, 2005. The Commissioner is authorized to charge all fees to the credit card provided by Applicant's attorneys on the

accompanying Credit Card Authorization form. Any deficiencies should be charged to deposit account 190011.

Respectfully submitted,

SACHNOFF & WEAVER, LTD.

Date: 10.13.2005

By: Loletta R. Darden

Loletta Darden
Registration No. 37,603
Attorney For Applicants
10 South Wacker Drive, 40th Floor
Chicago, IL 60606-7507
Telephone: (312) 207-1000
Facsimile: (312) 207-6400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS RESPONSE TO THE NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED APRIL 13, 2005, IS BEING DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS "EXPRESS MAIL POST OFFICE TO ADDRESS" MAILING LABEL NUMBER EV660110509US ON OCTOBER 13, 2005 IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO MAIL STOP RCE, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313-1450.

PATRICIA J. CONTRERAS

NAME OF INDIVIDUAL DEPOSITING PACKAGE IN THE U.S. POST OFFICE

Patricia J. Contreras

SIGNATURE

10.13.2005

DATE